APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/800,218	03/12/2004	Andrew G. Berezowski	91510	8571

7590 11/15/2005	**EXAMINER**
Patent Services Group	TRAN, QUOC DUC
Honeywell International, Inc.	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2643	

Patent Services Group
Honeywell International, Inc.
101 Columbia Road
P.O. Box 2245
Morristown, NJ 07962

DATE MAILED: 11/15/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/800,218	BEREZOWSKI ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Quoc D. Tran	2643

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>25 August 2005</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-32</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>20 and 21</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-19 and 22-32</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ .

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2.   Claims 10-11, 14-17, 19, 22-24 and 29-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being

anticipated by Troen-Krasnow et al (6,442,250).

Consider claim 10, Troen-Krasnow et al teach a system comprising: source software for

accepting an identification of at least one facility and at least one region therein into which audio

is to be broadcast via a local paging audio system (col. 6 line 65 – col. 7 line 65);

communications software for establishing communications, via a computer network, with

destination software for transmitting at least a facility identified, a region identifier, and a

representation of the audio to be broadcast; and destination software, responsive to a received

facility identifier and a received region identifier for interacting with a local paging audio system

to broadcast received audio into the identified facility and region (col. 4 lines 26-36; col. 9 lines

9-11).

Consider claim 11, Troen-Krasnow et al teach where the source software includes

graphical user interface software which graphically presents available facilities and regions for

selection (col. 4 lines 8-25).

Consider claim 14, Troen-Krasnow et al teach where the destination software includes software to control a local paging system in response to received facility and region identifiers (col. 4 lines 26-36; col. 9 lines 9-11).

Consider claim 15, Troen-Krasnow et al teach where the destination software includes digital to analog (i.e., data to voice) control software for received audio to be broadcast (col. 6 lines 23-32).

Consider claim 16, Troen-Krasnow et al teach where the destination software includes status reporting software to communicate, at least intermittently, via the computer network, with the source software (col. 6 lines 44-57).

Consider claim 17, Troen-Krasnow et al teach where the destination software includes audio processing software to transmit local audio to the source software, via the computer network, for audible presentation local to the source software (col. 8 lines 29-41).

Consider claim 19, Troen-Krasnow et al teach the system includes at least second destination software responsive to a received facility identifier and a received region identifier for interacting with a local paging audio system to broadcast received audio into the identified facility and region (col. 5 lines 10-15).

Consider claim 22, Troen-Krasnow et al teach a system comprising: a plurality of spaced apart paging interfaces (col. 4 lines 7-49), each interface includes software for specifying at least one displaced paging system and at least one zone therein and software enabling one interface to assert priority over any of the others (col. 8 line 7 line 51 – col. 8 line 4); software for receiving voice input to be transmitted to the at least one Zone (col. 8 lines 23-42).

Consider claim 23, Troen-Krasnow et al teach the system includes circuitry to support a

voice link to receive the voice input (col. 8 lines 28-31).

Consider claim 24, Troen-Krasnow et al teach where the voice link can be, at least in

part, wireless (col. 4 lines 7-20).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claims 1-9,12-13, 25-28 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Troen-Krasnow et al (6,442,250) in view of Kim et al (2004/0170159) and

further in view of Dorenbosch et al (6,108,544).

Consider claim 1, Troen-Krasnow et al teach a communications system (Fig. 1)

comprising: at least one audio input port, the port including; an input audio transducer coupled to

control circuitry for producing audio in a transmittable format (col. 8 lines 29-37); a database of

specifiable locations and selectable audio destinations in respective locations (col. 8 lines 43-61);

the control circuitry and the database are coupled to a bidirectional port for communicating with

selected locations via a computer network, the control circuitry forwarding location specifying

and destination selecting information via the port (col. 4 lines 26-36; col. 9 lines 9-11).

Troen-Krasnow et al did not suggest of producing real-time streaming digitized audio

signal. However, Kim et al suggested such (see page 1, ¶ 7-11).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary at the time the invention was made to utilize the teaching of Kim et al into view of Troen-Krasnow et al in order to provide information during time-critical situations.

Troen-Krasnow et al did not suggest of receiving feedback information from at least some of the selected locations indicative of operation status of devices at the selected locations. However, Dorenbosch et al suggested such (col. 9 lines 14-55).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Dorenbosch et al into view of Troen-Krasnow and Kim et al in order to effectively and reliably transmitting messages.

Consider claim 2, as suggested above, Troen-Krasnow et al teach the system includes a graphical user interface, coupled to the control circuitry enabling a user to select at least one location and at least one audio destination therein whereat audio from the input port is to be presented substantially in real time (col. 4 lines 8-25).

Consider claim 3, Troen-Krasnow et al teach where the graphical user interface displays a plurality of selectable locations and a plurality of selectable destinations within each location where audio can be simultaneously presented in real time (col. 7 line 54 – col. 8 line 20).

Consider claim 4, Troen-Krasnow et al teach where the database includes information pertaining to a plurality of selectable locations and a plurality of possible destinations of audio associated with respective locations (col. 8 lines 50-56).

Consider claim 5, Troen-Krasnow et al teach where the database includes information pertaining to a plurality of selectable locations and a plurality of possible destinations of audio associated with respective locations (col. 6 lines 9-22).

Consider claim 6, Troen-Krasnow et al teach the system includes software enabling a user to add a location and an associated plurality of destinations (col. 8 lines 5-19).

Consider claim 7, Troen-Krasnow et al teach the system includes software for constructing paging system control commands for transmission to the specified location (col. 4 line 64 – col. 5 line 9).

Consider claim 8, Troen-Krasnow et al teach the system includes gateway software for receipt of the location specifying and destination specifying information (col. 4 lines 1-6).

Consider claim 9, as suggested above, Troen-Krasnow et al teach the system includes audio signal circuitry, coupled to the gateway software, for producing real-time audio in at least one selected zone (col. 3 line 61 – col. 4 line 6).

Consider claim 12, Troen-Krasnow et al did not clearly suggest where the source software includes audio compression software. However, Kim et al suggested such (page 1, ¶ 11). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Kim et al into view of Troen-Krasnow et al in order to increase transmission rate.

Consider claim 13, Troen-Krasnow et al did not clearly suggest where the source software includes encryption software. However, Kim et al suggested such (page 3, ¶ 42 and 43). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Kim et al into view of Troen-Krasnow et al in order to secure the communications.

5.   Claims 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Troen-Krasnow et al (6,442,250) in view of Sachdev (6,574,338).

Consider claim 18, Troen-Krasnow et al did not suggest where the destination software includes audio related decryption software. However, Sachdev suggested such (col. 7 lines 7-14). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Sachdev into view of Troen-Krasnow et al in order to decode secured transmission information.

Newly added claims

Newly added claims 25-32 contain similar features discussed above, therefore, the rejection will be the same as the above.

Response to Arguments

6.   Applicant's arguments filed 8/26/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding applicant argument on pages 7-8 that Troen-Krasnow wt al does not disclose a system to "control and audio output via local paging audio system" nor "a plurality of spaced apart paging interfaces". Accordingly, the examiner respectfully disagrees with applicant argument. Troen-Krasnow et al teaches a *message broadcast system* (i.e., paging system) for broadcasting messages to *groups of recipients having plurality types of interface devices* (see Fig. 1, col. 4). This clearly read on applicant limitation as claimed.

Conclusion

7.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

8.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this

Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this

final action.

9.   Any response to this action should be mailed to:

> Mail Stop ____(explanation, e.g., Amendment or After-final, etc.)
> Commissioner for Patents
> P.O. Box 1450
> Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
> Facsimile responses should be faxed to:
> **(571) 273-8300**
> Hand-delivered responses should be brought to:
> Customer Service Window
> Randolph Building
> 401 Dulany Street
> Alexandria, VA 22314

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the
examiner should be directed to **Quoc Tran** whose telephone number is **(571) 272-7511.** The
examiner can normally be reached on M, T, TH and Friday from 8:00 to 6:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's
supervisor, **Curtis Kuntz,** can be reached on **(571) 272-7499.**

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding
should be directed to the **Technology Center 2600** whose telephone number is **(571) 272-2600.**

QUOC TRAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER